

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Farmer WO 02/39486 ("Farmer"). Claims 7, 15, and 19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farmer in view of Yung et al. (US 6,909,974) ("Yung"). Claims 1, 8 and 16 have been amended. Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 USC 102(b) and 35 USC 103(a) rejections for the reasons provided below.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6, 8-14, 16-18, and 20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection over Farmer, Applicant asserts that Farmer does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Applicant submits that Farmer fails to teach each and every feature of claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 8 and 16), as amended.

Claim 1 (and similarly claims 8 and 16) have been amended to recite: "a selecting system for forming the chain of Web services by selecting a Web service from the list of available Web services for each of a plurality of tasks in the workflow, wherein the workflow comprises a series of linked tasks and a specified input and output format, wherein the selecting system examines a set of available Web services capable of

completing each task and identifies at least one Web service having matching input and output signatures ensuring that each Web service selected to complete a task is compatible with adjacent Web services in the chain of Web services.” Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at page 8, lines 1-5.

Farmer does not teach the feature: “wherein the selecting system examines a set of available Web services capable of completing each task and identifies at least one Web service having matching input and output signatures ensuring that each Web service selected to complete a task is compatible with adjacent Web services in the chain of Web services.”

The Office previously cited to Figures 3 and 11 and paragraphs 0022, 0057, 0058, 0061, 0062, and 0071-0076 of Farmer in support of its allegations that Farmer taught the feature now deleted from claim 1 (and similarly claims 8 and 16). The citations to Farmer provided by the Office do not teach the matching of Web services based upon their respective input and output signatures. Rather the citations provided and the counter-arguments made by the Office state the messages between invoked programs are wrapped with a simple Java class. [0071] and Final Office Action p.12. Farmer states “This Java wrapper handles the broadcast and reception of integrated system events and transmits them in terms the program can understand.” [0071] The Office states “This is accomplished by the execution of a chain of Web services involving wrapping the messages passed within the system in a simple Java class for communication.” Final Office Action p.12. Applicant’s amendment to claim 1 makes clear that the wrapping of the messages to accomplish communication between Web services is not applicable. The Office’s response in the advisory action explains the

examiner's interpretations of Farmer's results but not how those results are achieved and, respectfully, does not respond to Applicant's substantive arguments. Thus, Farmer does not teach these features.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/David E. Rook/

Date: July 29, 2008

David E. Rook
Reg. No.: 40,790

Hoffman, Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)